



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/727,709	12/04/2000	Stacy Bryant	52493.000126	3945

7590 02/26/2003

Hunton & Williams
1900 K Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20006-1109

EXAMINER

THAI, HANH B

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2171

DATE MAILED: 02/26/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/727,709

Applicant(s)

BRYANT ET AL.

Examiner

Hanh B Thai

Art Unit

2171

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on the Amendment dated 12/11/2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ 6) ☐ Other: _____

Art Unit: 2171

This is in response to the Amendment dated December 11, 2002.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-5, 7, 20, 22 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Northington et al. (U. S. Patent no. 6,128,602).

1. Regarding claims 1-3 and 22, Northington discloses a process for performing administrative functions connected with a sales related database comprising the steps of:

- receiving updated information (see column 9, lines 42-48) for the sales-related database in a file configured in a predetermined format, the updated information being provided by a user interacting with an administrative tool having at least one of a login module (see col. 6, lines 52-60), a report builder module, a broker operations module, a database access module, and a file upload module (see col. 7, lines 51-53, Northington);
- saving the configured file containing the updated information to the sales related database (column 9, lines 49-58); and

Art Unit: 2171

- uploading the sales-related database to a web-based database using the administrative tool (see column 7, lines 45-53).

Northington does not explicitly disclose the upload module. But, Northington teaches using “known in the art” programs to accomplish uploading of data (see column 7, lines 45-53). The examiner takes official notice that program modules for such a purpose were well known, and in fact contemplated by Northington’s express suggestion. Hence, it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skilled in the art at the time of the invention to use the well known upload module and associate it with the upload process in Northington. The motivation of doing so would have been to create and debug software efficiently. Specially, it was well known that coding in modules allows for parallel debugging, resulting better and less time.

2. Regarding claim 4, Northington disclose a system for performing functions relating to administration of sales agents, brokers, distributors or dealers connected with a sales-related database comprising:

a user-interactive administrative tool for providing updated information to a sales-related database, the administrative tool having at least one of:

- “a user login module” for restricting access to the system (see col. 6, lines 52-60 and col. 10, line 66 to col. 11, line3, Northington);
- “a database access” for accessing data stored in the sales-related database and for reading one or more configured files (see col. 8, lines 9-13); and

Art Unit: 2171

- “a file upload” for uploading data to the sales-related database and the system (see column 7, lines 45-53).

Northington, however, does not explicitly disclose “access module” and “upload module”. But, Northington teaches using “known in the art” programs to accomplish uploading of data (see column 7, lines 45-53) and “levels of access” (see col. 2, lines 44-53, Northington). The examiner takes official notice that program modules for such a purpose were well known, and in fact contemplated by Northington’s express suggestion. Hence, it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skilled in the art at the time of the invention to use the well known upload module and associate it with the upload process in Northington. The motivation of doing so would have been to create and debug software efficiently. Specially, it was well known that coding in modules allows for parallel debugging, resulting better and less time.

3. Regarding claim 5, Northington further discloses the system comprising a report building module for presenting data in one or more predetermined formats, for generating one or more reports (see col. 8, lines 1-9), and for tracking access (see col. 8, lines 9-13) and navigation through the sales databases (see col. 8, lines 41-55, Northington).

4. Regarding claim 7, Northington discloses all of the claimed subject matter as discussed above, except Northington does not disclose “HTTP servlet module”. Northington, however, discloses the Web interface using browser software (see col. 8, lines 7-18) and the “HTTP sevlet module” must be included in that Web interface.

Art Unit: 2171

5. Regarding claims 20 and 24, a process for updating information relating to administration of sales agent, brokers, distributors or dealers in a sales-related database comprising the steps of:

- receiving an access request (see col. 6, lines 52-60 and col. 10, line 66 to col. 11, line 3, Northington);
- determining if the access request is valid (see col. 6, line 59 to col. 7, line 4);
- receiving updated information if the access request is valid, the updated information being provided by a user interacting with an administrative tool having at least one of a login module, a report builder module, a broker operations module, a database access module, and file upload module (see column 9, lines 42-48);
- verifying the received updated information (col. 6, lines 49-59, Northington).

Northington, however, does not explicitly disclose “replicating the sales-related database”. But, Northington discloses the data’s uploads and downloads processing (see col. 7, lines 51-53, Northington). It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skilled in the art at the time of the invention to replicate database by downloading data. The examiner notes, by definition, as soon as the data is downloaded and or uploaded, and the process is completed the data has been replicated. The motivation of doing so would have been to transmit data to the users.

Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Northington et al. (U. S. Patent no. 6,128,602) in view of Harris et al. (U. S. Patent no. 5,893,904).

6. Regarding claim 6, Northington discloses all of the claimed subject matter as discussed above, except Northington does not disclose “broker module”. Harris, however, discloses this limitation (see column 17, lines 49-63 and 18, lines 50-54). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teaching of Northington to include the broker module as taught by Harris. The motivation of doing so would have been to manage the brokers’ information.

Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Northington et al. (U. S. Patent no. 6,128,602) in view of Kappel (U. S. Patent no. 6,144,988).

7. Regarding claim 8, Northington discloses all of the claimed subject matter as discussed above, except Northington does not disclose “plurality of servlets”. Kappel, however, discloses multiple servlets (Processing Servlet and Offer Servlet, Fig. 4, Kappel). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Northington as taught by Kappel to describe the communication over the web server (column 1, lines 44-46, Kappel).

Claims 9, 19 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Northington et al. (U. S. Patent no. 6,128,602) in view of Discount et al. (U. S. Patent no. 6,012,066).

Art Unit: 2171

8. Regarding claims 9, 19 and 23, Northington discloses a process for performing functions relating to administration of sales agents, brokers, distributors or dealers connected with a sales-related database comprising the steps of:

- receiving login information from a client system (see col. 6, lines 52-56, Northington);
- determining if the login information is valid (see col. 6, lines 56-60);
- transmitting an administrative functions home page to the client system if the login information is valid, the administrative functions home page being associated with an administrative tool having at least one of a login module, a report builder module, a broker operations module, a database access module, and a file upload module (column 6, line 56 to col. 7, line 4, Northington);
- receiving updated information in a predetermined format, the updated information being provided by a user interacting with the administrative tool (see col. 9, lines 42-48)
- updating the sales-related database to store the received updated information (see col. 9, lines 49-58, Northington).

Northington, however, does not explicitly disclose receiving a function link selection from the client system, determining which function link was selected and displaying an administrative function screen corresponding to the function link selected. Discount, on the other hand, discloses the web function links (see column 1, lines 10-56, Discount), the selected link and displayed screen (see Fig. 8D and col. 8, lines 15-51, Discount). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skilled in the art at the time of the invention to modify Northington to include

Art Unit: 2171

the function links as taught by Discount. The motivation of doing so would have been to process and display the requested information by the users over the Internet.

Claims 10-11 and 13-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Northington et al. (U. S. Patent no. 6,128,602) in view of in view Discount et al. (U. S. Patent no. 6,012,066), and further view of Raveis (U. S. Patent no. 6,321,202).

9. Regarding claims 10-11, Northington/ Discount combination discloses all of the claimed subject matter as discussed above, except "broker information ". Raveis, however, discloses the detail broker information (see column 5, lines 8-20 and Fig. 5, Raveis), displaying the broker information screen (Fig. 4-5) and updated information entered in at least one field (field 351, 352 or 354, Fig. 8A) in the broker information screen. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skilled in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Northington and Discount to include the broker information links as taught by Raveis. The motivation of doing so would have been to manage the brokers' information over the Internet.

10. Regarding claims 13-18, Northington/ Discount/Raveis combination discloses all of the claimed subject matter as discussed above, except "a rate change", "report", "quote". It would have been obvious to have this information in real estate services as evidenced by Raveis because these are the elements of a complete mortgage processing of Raveis' system (see Fig. 5, Raveis).

Art Unit: 2171

Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Northington et al. (U. S. Patent no. 6,128,602) in view of in view Discount et al. (U. S. Patent no. 6,012,066), further view of Raveis (U. S. Patent no. 6,321,202) and further view of O'Neil et al. (U. S. Patent no. 5,987,440).

11. Regarding claim 12, Northington/ Discount/Raveis combination discloses all of the claimed subject matter as discussed above, except Northington/ Discount/Raveis does not disclose "broker public key" for encryption purposes. O'Neil, however, discloses this limitation (see FIG. 4 and col. 9, lines 9-26, O'Neil). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skilled in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Northington/Discount/Raveis to include the public-key cryptography as taught by O'Neil. The motivation of doing so would have been to transfer securely information over the Internet.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-24 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Art Unit: 2171

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hanh B Thai whose telephone number is 703-305-4883. The examiner can normally be reached on 8 AM - 4:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Safet Metjahic can be reached on 703-308-1436. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-746-9099 for regular communications and 703-746-7240 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

Hanh Thai
Art Unit 2171
February 21, 2003



SAFET METJAHIC
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100